NATIONALISM
AND
INDIA

By

Maulana Sayyid Abul A'la Maududi

CONTENTS

Foreword	5
Nationalism and India	7
Nationalism and Islam	10
The European Conception of Nationalism	12
The Fundamental Difference Between Nationalism and Islam	19
The Aim of Western Nationalism	26
Why is the World Fallen Under the Curse of nationalism	30
Nationalism in India	31
The Essentials of Nationalism	31
Are the Factors of Nationalism Obtainable in India?	33
How can Indian Nationalism Take Birth?	34
Can Any Well-Wisher of India Think of the Encouragement of Nationalism Here?	39
Western Dress	41

*****

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيْمِ

In the Name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful!

FOREWORD

The people of India are perhaps the most unfortunate on earth. Their modern history is particularly tragic and pitiable. It was in early seventeenth century that the nations of Europe began the colonial invasion of the Orient. By the middle of the nineteenth century they had practically occupied the whole of western and southern Asia. Now these conqueror-colonists had nothing in common with the people with whom they came into contact; moreover since they were the masters they thought that all that was theirs was good, beautiful and noble, and all that was foreign was wrong, ugly and inhuman. They called the Eastern nations superstitious, uncultured and barbarian. And as subject races always endeavour to imbibe and inhale the spirit of their rules, these slave peoples of Asia, too, in due course of time, began to look upon the Westerners as the only leaders of human thought and human civilisation. The dawning of this consiciousness in the East has served as the greatest instrument in the hands of European imperialism up till this day.

Now the most important thing in the European concept of life is the philosophy of nationalism, which is today the backbone of social organisations in the entire West. This same philosophy was imported into India, the greatest European colony in the world, long ago. For more than half a century the peoples of this subcontinent dreamt that their salvation lay in cooperating with and in following in the footsteps of their overlords. At the end of this period a great

and powerful intelligentsia was born in the land and the ideas of western political science, based chiefly on democracy and nationalism, began to convulse India from end to end. The fight for the freedom of the "Motherland" began to gather force. Gradually it became so important that now it is said to be the only problem of India. Now the inspiring spirit of this "Freedom Movement" is the principle of Nationalism, the same principle which is the support of the rulers. But the cause of these fighters has been seriously endangered by the presence in the country of a population of ninety million Muslims, whose ideology of life stands in total contrast to the theory of nationalism. Sayyid Abul A'la Maududi is the first great thinker of this age to define and explain this ideology and point out not only to the soldiers and leaders of the Indian political movements but to the peoples of the world in general that it is not Nationalism but only Islam which provides a true and just social philosophy for the organisation of human society on this earth. In this essay under review Sayyid Abul A'la, after discussing the general principles, has taken into consideration the special case of India and proved that Nationalism can never solve the problem of this country. It is a brief thesis but on the subject of Nationalism there are few things more worth reading in modern political literature.

Qamar-ud-din Khan

NATIONALISM AND INDIA

The most important philosophy of life that is today governing not only India but the entire world is the philosophy of nationalism. This unfortunate passion of nations has made the life of man miserable on this planet. The strangest thing is that even Muslims, who by the very nature of their creed ought to have been free of this bias, have succumbed to it. There is a notable section of Muslims in this country which vehemently recommends the adoption of European conception of nationalism for the following reasons:

1. The whole earth has been conquered by the Western philosophy of life, therefore, if we want to exist we must submit to it.
2. In ancient times our country enjoyed a great reputation among the nations of the world. In order to regain that past glory we must enhance and establish our prestige among the nations of today. And this prestige we can establish only by aping Europe.
3. Generally speaking, India has had two civilizations in the past – the Hindu and Muslim. Both these civilizations were and are based on two different systems of religion. But the third and modern civilization which has imposed itself on the former two, is completely divorced from religion; its foundations rest on pure science and empirical philosophy. Therefore, unless we conform and adapt to this new mode of thinking and living we cannot hope to achieve anything.

Now consider these three arguments. Something is recommended not on account of its inherent righteousness

and truth or its moral worth and propriety, but on account of pure expediency and utility. How can a Muslim or for the matter of that, any man of principle, listen to this piece of advice? Anybody who subscribes to a rational and moral ideology of life, and who feels an urge from within to propagate and establish that ideology, can hardly accept a creed or principle which advocates its adoption on the basis that this thing may be avoided, that thing is more profitable, this thing has fallen into disuse and that thing has taken its place in the market. This is mere pragmatism and opportunism, what has it to do with reason and morals? Reason and morals demand that we must adhere with firmness to what has been found to be true in scientific analysis and correct in moral judgment. If against it some wrong ideology has found a vogue in the world our duty is not to go after it but to force the world to fall in line with us. Our real test consists in bearing with patience and resignation the hardships and injuries that would be inflicted on us by not following the course that is not ours. We should spurn a world which denies us respect because we challenge its leadership. Prestige is no good that in order to win its favour we should begin to tramp on every path where we find its glimpse. If a thing, which we know to be true according to our conscience, has gone out of use we should have courage and resolution in us to force the world to conform to it. It is the attitude of cowardly and defeated mentalities to propitiate the whims of times.

In this matter Muslims should display at least that amount of steadfastness which shown by the followers of Marx at the outbreak of the Great War of 1914 -18. When the war had started a great difference arose among the members of the Second International on this very issue of nationalism. Many socialists who had gathered on the Socialist International Front, seeing that their respective

nations had plunged into the war, were swayed over by nationalistic sentiments and wished to join their national armies. But the Marxists said that they were pledged to fight for an ideology according to which the capitalists of all nations stood as their enemies and the labourers of all nations stood as their friends; therefore they could not support that nationalism which creates dissensions and divisions among labourers and brings them to opposite fronts in the company of capitalists. On this ground the Marxists separated from their comrades with whom they had relations of long standing. They could bear the break-up of the Second International but could not bear giving up their cherished principles. Nay, they proceeded further. Those who were true communists broke the idol of nationalism with their own hands. To defend their principles the German communists fought against Germany, the Russian communists against Russia, and similarly the communists of other countries fought against the governments of their own respective nations.

Exactly like a communits, a Muslim also possesses an ideology of his own. Then why should he degrade himself so much that in order to gain something or to save his head from some injury he may have to shift his position? And if he shifts at all, he must have the consciousness as from what position he is shifting and what other position he means to occupy. Because to shift one's position for nothing is sheer weakness, but having shifted to a new position to think that one is at one's old position carries with it weakness and stupidity both. I am a Muslim only so long as I uphold the Islamic view-point in every concern of life. If I have shifted to another view-point it would be simply absurd on my part to think that I still retain the state of being a Muslim. To be a Muslim and to adopt a non-Islamic view-point is only meaningless. "Muslim

Nationalist" and "Muslim communist" are as contradictory terms as "Communist Fascist", "Socialist Capitalist", "Chaste Prostitute?"

NATIONALISM AND ISLAM

Even a cursory glance at the meaning and essence of nationalism would convince a person that in their spirit and in their aims Islam and nationalism are diametrically opposed to each other. Islam deals with man as man. It presents to all mankind a social system of justice and piety based on creed and morality and invites all towards it. And then it admits him in its circle, with equal rights, whosoever accepts this system. Be it in the sphere of economics or politics or civics or legal rights and duties or anything else. Those who accept the principles of Islam are not divided by any distinction of nationality or race or class or country. The ultimate goal of Islam is a world state in which the chains of racial and national prejudices would be dismantled and all mankind incorporated in a cultural and political system, with equal rights and equal opportunities for all, and in which hostile competitions would give way to friendly co-operation between peoples so that they might mutually assist and contribute to the material and moral good of one another. Whatever the principle of human good Islam defines, and whatever the scheme of life it prescribes, it would appeal to mankind in general only when they would free themselves of all ignorant prejudices and dissociate themselves altogether from their national traditions, with their sentiments of racial pride, and with their love of sanguinary and material affinities, and be prepared, as mere human beings to inquire what is truth, where lies righteousness, justice and honesty, and what is the path that leads to the well-being of, not a class or a nation or a country, but of humanity as a whole.

As opposed to this, nationalism divides man from man on the basis of nationality. Nationalism simply means that the nationalist should give preference to his nationality over all other nationalities. Even if he were not an aggressive nationalist, nationalism, at least demands that culturally, economically, politically and legally he should differentiate between national and non-national; secure the maximum of advantages for his nation; build up barriers of economic preferences for national profit; protect with tenacity the historical traditions and the traditional prejudices which has come down to wake his nationality, and breed in him the sentiments of national pride. He would not admit with him members of other nationalities in any walk of life on an equal basis. Whenever there is a chance of his nation obtaining more advantages as against the other, his heart would be sealed against all sentiments of justice and propriety. His ultimate goal would be a nation-state rather than a worldstate, nevertheless if he upholds any world ideology, the ideology would necessarily take the form of imperialism or world domination, because members of other nationalities cannot participate in his state as equals, they may do so only, as "salves" or subjects.

This is a mere outline of the principles, aims and spirits of the two creeds, a little reflection on which would amply evidence that these two creeds are the reverse of each other. Islam cannot flourish in the lap of nationalism, and nationalism too cannot find a place in the fold of Islam. The progress of nationalism would starve Islam to death and the progress of Islam would sound the death-knell to nationalism. Now it is obvious, a person can give support to the progress of only one creed at a time. It is impossible that he should sail in two ships at once. To declare allegiance to one creed and, at the same time, to support and advocate the cause of an opposite creed, only betrays a

confusion of mind and a looseness of thinking, and those who do so, about them we are obliged to say that they are ignorant of Islam or of nationalism or of both.

THE EUROPEAN CONCEPTION OF NATIONALISM

The above knowledge we have gained by an elementary consideration of nationalism. Now let us examine a little more thoroughly that concept of Nationalism which is presented as a secret of success by a section of Indian Muslims.

In ancient times of "Ignorance" the concept of nationalism had not properly grown. The sentiments of man were associated more with race and clan than with "nation". As a consequence those times were dominated by racialism rather than nationalism, and this racial vanity had blinded to truth even the greatest intellectuals and philosophers of the age. A great thinker like Aristotle asserts in his *politics* that "Nature intended barbarians to be Slaves."[1] Also among the natural and honourable means of acquiring wealth he classes making war in order to reduce to slavery such of mankind as are intended by nature for it.[2] This view becomes more dreadful when we realise that by "barbarian" the Greeks meant simply "non-Greek", their fundamental conception being that the moral and human rights of the Greeks essentially differed from those of the rest of mankind.

This was the germinal constitution of nationalism that in later times developed in Europe. The force that resisted the progress and evolution of this germ for a good while was the force of Christianity. The teachings of a *Rasool* in

[1] Vide Book I, Ch. II
[2] Vide Book I, ch. VIII.

however distorted a form it functioned must have incorporated in them a wider human consideration than racialism and nationalism. Along with it, the world-imperialism of Rome did much to reduce the intensity of racial and national prejudices by bringing a large number of small nations under one common sovereignty under the control of one central government. Thus for centuries together the spiritual domination of the Pope and the political supremacy of the Emperor wedded together, kept the whole of Christendom under one system. But both their powers mutually co-operated in there tyrannies and persecutions and in their resistance to rational and scientific progress, and were mutually arrayed against each other in their fight for worldly power and material gains. On one hand their mutual rivalries and on the other their corruptions, tyrannies and oppressions, combined with the literary renaissance, produced in the sixteenth century that well-known political and religious convulsion which goes in history by the name of the Reformation Movement.

One direct result of this movement was that the power of the Pope and the Emperor which stood against all reform and progress, came to an end. But one harmful consequence was that the nations which had lived together were now scattered. The Reformation would not provide a substitute for that spiritual communion which had bound together the nations of Christendom. After the break-up of religious and political unity when the nations parted from one another they began to establish their own individual national independent states. The language and literature of each nation carved out a separate line of progress for itself. The economic interests of each nation were demarcated from those to others. Thus a new conception of nationality was built on political, economic and cultural foundations which took the place of ancient pagan conception of racial

prejudice. Then commenced mutual conflict, instigation and competition between nations. Wars were raged; one nation snatched the rights of another nation; worst demonstrations of tyranny and cruelty were made which gradually raised the bitterness of national sentiments to such high pitch that the consciousness of nationality was converted into nationalism.

This nationalism whose growth has occurred in Europe in this fashion, because it is born out of competition and conflict with neighbouring nations, embodies the following four essential ingredients in its nature:-

1. The sentiment of national pride which leads a nation from loving its national traditions and characteristics to the worshipping of them, and which compels a nation to exalt itself over all other nations in every respect.
2. The sentiment of national consciousness which, keeping aside the question of truth and justice, obliges a man to support his nation whether it stands for right or wrong.
3. The sentiment of national self-preservation which, to protect its actual and visionary interests, compels every nation to adopt tactics which commencing with self-defence end in invasion. For instance a nation may be obliged in increase or decrease customs duty on import and export to protect its economic interests; may impose restrictions on the emigration and immigration of other nationals; deprive foreigners of civil rights and opportunities of earning sustenance within its frontiers; outview other nations in organising its fighting services for the defence of the country; march into other lands to safeguard the rights and interests of its nationals.
4. The sentiment or national prestige and national aggrandisement which produces in every progressive

and powerful nation the assertion that it should dominate and rule over the nations of the earth; increase its happiness at the expense of others; regard itself as appointed to civilise backward nations; and claim as birth-right the exploiting of the natural wealth of other countries.

This is that nationalism of Europe in the ecstasy of which one exclaims, "Germany over all", another declares "America is God's own country", another proclaims, "Italy is religion", another announces to the world, "To rule is Britannia". Every nationalist makes it an article of faith, "My country! Right or wrong." This mania of nationalism has descended on humanity as the greatest curse in the world; it is the greatest menace to human civilisation; it makes man wolf to all other nations except its own.

This nationalism means not only that a person should love his nation and wish it to be free, happy and progress – if it were so it would be a noble sentiment. It is, in fact, generated and nurtured by the sentiments of hostility, hatred and revenge rather than by those of love. The spirit of its inception is that fire which is enkindled in the hearts of men by trampled national ambitions and the injured sentiments of a nation. And this fire, this stupid national love inflates the noble sentiment of patriotism so much so that it becomes ignoble and ugly. Apparently it rises to redress the injustices inflicted or supposed to have been inflicted on the nation by another nation or nations, but, since it is not guided and regulated by any moral code, by any spiritual teaching, by any God-made law, it exceeds its limits and assumes the forms of imperialism economic nationalism, racial hatred, war and international anarchy. An observer of our own age, Francis W. Coker, writes:-

"Some writers have maintained, however, that this right of independent existence belongs only to the better

people of the world–those who have spiritual and cultural values peculiarly worth preserving and disseminating. They argue, moreover, that a highly civilised nation has the right and obligation not only to protect its independence and administer its internal affairs without interference from others but also to expand its sway, by force if necessary, over more backward peoples. A superior nation, it is said, has a world vocation: it has no right to bury its talents or to exploit them selfishly. This was the common theoretical argument supporting the movement of colonial expansion of the later nineteenth century, whereby "low-culture" races of Africa and the Pacific Island were brought under the sway of the States of Europe and America. The latter were simply assuming the "White man's burden." Imperialism was as much a duty as a right, decreed by some law of the development of civilisation."

Further on he writes:-

"A 'great nation,' it is said, has right not only to defend itself against direct attack but also to resist whatever threatens interest of essential importance to its independence and prosperity. Moreover. For any nation to survive, it has more to do than preserve its territorial integrity, protect its material resources, and vindicate its honour. It must also grow – expand its domain, increase its military strength, exalt its national prestige; otherwise it will fall into decay and succumb in the inevitable competition between nations. The nations that succeed best in protecting their interests and enlarging their spheres of political and economic influence prove thereby prior right to survive. War, moreover, is the natural instrumentality of national expansion and its outcome is the test of the right of expand. "It is war that makes nations."

"This biological historical support for war has drawn support from a few distinguished scientists. Ernst Haeckel–

first and most influential apostle of Darwinism in Germany–who was diligent in making broad philosophical and sociological applications of his biological ideas, contended that egoism, which he characterised as a universal biological law, manifested itself in human society in a sort of racial cannibalism. The earth, he said, has insufficient resources for all the racial groups that appear upon its surface. The weaker groups perish not only through their incapacity to compete effectively in the common struggle for the limited supply of the means of life but also through their inability to defend themselves against conquest and ultimate annihilation by the stronger groups. Karal Pearson likewise characterised international strife as part of 'the natural history of mankind.' A 'scientific view of life,' he maintained, must recognise that human progress comes about through an eternal contest not only between individuals but also of race against race. As a superior nation increases its internal efficiency by taking steps to insure that its weaker stocks die off, so it achieves external efficiency–and thus advances the evolution of the whole human race–by continually contending with other strong nations and crushing out the weaker nations. It can prove its equality with other superior nations only by constantly struggling with them for trade routes, sources of raw materials, and food supplies. When it comes into contact with inferior groups, it either surrenders any claim to superiority by mixing with them or adopting its ways to their ways or vindicates its superiority by ejecting the inferior groups or exploiting them to its own uses."[1]

Another writer, Joseph Leighton, writes:-

"The history of the world, since the fifteenth century, is very largely the story of the economic rivalries of nation-

[1] Resent political thought, New York, 1934, pp.443-48.

states. Economic nationalism has become more and more a cause of conflict–of commercial struggles precipitating wars. The conquest and settlement of America, of Africa, and the island of the seven seas, the conquest and exploitation of large parts of Asia, are aspects of this predatory tale. It is the continuation on a much vaster scale, of the predatory invasions by the barbarians when Rome fell. But, whereas, out of the remains of the Roman Empire an international order was built on a religious, ethical, and cultural foundation, as yet that has not happened in the modern world."[1]

At another occasion this same writer points out:-

"When cultural nationality coincides with political autonomy, when the cultural nation is an economic unity, and this cultural-politico-economic unity is imbued with the feeling of its greatness and superiority, in the competitive struggle of politico-conomic national groups we get the extreme form of economic nationalism, tending towards economic imperialism, that is national struggle for commercial advantages against other nations. These advantages consist in capturing foreign market and in getting backward regions to exploit."

"The dilemma of politico-economic nationalism is this: the nation-state is the necessary instrument for furthering the welfare of its people; not only their economic well-being but their cultural development – their education, science, arts, and so on – depend on the prosperity of the nation-state. But under the competitive system economic nationalism, which means the attempt of prosper at the expense of other people breeds rivalries, suspicions, fears, hatreds between peoples, and from the state of economic

[1] Social Philosophies in Conflict, New York. 1937 pp.439.

international conflict the passage is all too easy to open warfare."[1]

THE FUNDAMENTAL DEIFFERENCE BETWEEN NATIONALISM AND ISLAM

I have thought it more proper to describe the mode of thinking and method of working of western nationalism in the words of the westerners themselves, so that a true and a faithful picture of it drawn by its own high priests may come to your notice. The extracts quoted above are a definite proof that the conceptions and principles, which have been responsible for the development of nationalism in Europe are just the reverse of humanity; they have degraded man to the level of beasts, they have made him worse than wolves. These principles have filled God's earth with evils, tyrannies and bloodshed, and thwarted the peaceful evolution of human civilization. These principles have blighted the sacred ideals for which the messengers of God have endeavoured since the earliest times. These satanic principles have stood as formidable obstacles and powerful adversaries against the moral and spiritual teachings embodied in the heavenly books, and against the law of God. These principles make man narrow-minded[2] and biased; they arraign nations and races against one another and make them blind to truth, justice and humanity; they strike a vital blow on the very foundations of the law of God by replacing the moral truth with material power and beastly force.

---

[1] Social Philosophies in Conflict, New York. 1937 pp.4-5

[2] The height of this narrow-mindedness is well displayed in the fact that import of Indian mangoes into Japan has been stopped. It simply means that a people have denied to themselves one of the blessings of God which He has bestowed on this earth only on the ground that it grows in the land of another people.

The law of God (the *shariat*) has always aimed at bringing together mankind into one moral and spiritual frame-work and make them mutually assistant to one another on a universal scale. But nationalism at once demolishes this frame-work with the noxious instruments of racial and national distinction, and by creating bitterness and hatred between nations makes them fight and exterminate rather than help one another.

The *shariats* of God provide the highest opportunities of free contact between man and man because on this very contact depends the progress of human civilization and culture. But nationalism comes in the way of these contacts with a thousand hindrances; it makes the mere existence of foreign nationals in a country possible.

The *shariats* of God want that every individual, every nation, every race, should obtain full opportunities of developing its natural characteristics and its inherent potentialities so that it may be able to subscribe its due share to the collective progress of mankind. But nationalism urges upon every race, every nation that it should secure power and degrade and disgrace and belittle other races and nations and bring them under servility, and deny them any chance of developing their natural talents and resources, and deprive them even of primary right of mere existence.

The fundamental principle of the *shariats* of God is that the rights of man are based on moral code and not on force. That is, if the moral law sanctions a right to a weak individual or weak people, the powerful individual or the powerful people must honour this right. But in contrast to this, nationalism establishes the principle that "might is right" and that the weak has no right because he has no might.

As within moral limits the *shariats* of God are not opposed to individual self-preservation, so within the same limits, they are not opposed to national self-preservation. They rather encourage it, because the collective progress of humanity is dependent on the fact that each nation should progress within its own sphere. But the heavenly *shariats* encourage a national self-love which should extend to humanity at large its sympathy, co-operation and well-wishing and do it the service which the rivers of the earth do to the ocean. In contrary to this, nationalism breeds in man a mentality that he should invest all his powers and capabilities only to the enhancement of his own nation and not only not help humanity at large but sacrifice the interest of humanity for the interest of his nation. What is selfishness in individual life is nationalism in social life. A nationalist is naturally narrow-minded and niggardly. He sees all the good of the world only in his own nation or race. In other nations and races he does not find anything which may deserve life and perpetuation. The best example of this mentality is illustrated by the national-socialism of Germany. Hitler defines a national-socialist as follows: "Whoever is prepared to make the national cause his own to such an extent that he knows no higher ideal than the welfare of his nation, whoever in addition has understood our great national anthem, 'Deutschland uber alles' to mean that nothing in the wide world surpasses in his eyes this German people and land – that man is a national-socialist."[1]

In his book My struggle Hitler writes:-

All that we admire on this earth – science, arts, technical skill and invention – is the creative product of only a small number of nations and originally, perhaps of one single race ... if we divide the human race into three

[1] Konrad Heiden, History of National Socialism, p.85.

categories – founders, maintainers and destroyers of culture – the Aryan stock alone can be considered as representing the first category."[1]

It is this racial pride that has made the lives of non-Aryans in Germany impossible, and it is on this foundation that the theory of German world-domination is based. According to a national-socialist the German nation is appointed to the mission that it should enslave the "low nation" of the world and use them as instruments in the dissemination of" culture and civilization"; and this is not something particular with Germany. Also in the democratic America the colour-distinction is based on the same theory. A white American would under no circumstances be prepared to concede a negro the status of man. And this is indeed the religion of every nation in Europe, be it Britain or France; Italy or Holland.

Again an essential feature of this nationalism is that it makes man opportunist. The *shariats* of God are given to man to make him live by principles and relate his behaviour to permanent laws which would not alter with individual or national interests. But unlike it, nationalism makes man unprincipled. A nationalist has no principles in the world except that he wishes the good of his nation. If the laws of ethics, injunctions of religion, and principles of culture, serve his purpose he would put his faith in them gladly, but if they interfered with his interest he would set them aside and invent and adopt some other principles and theories. We find an ideal illustration of the character of a nationalist in the carrier of Mussolini. Before the Great War of 1914-18 he was a socialist. After the outbreak of the war he severed from the socialists only because he saw that his nation would gain if Italy entered the war. But when Italy

[1] Hurst and Blacket, London p.12.

could not secure what she wanted from the booty of war he inaugurated the new fascist movement. He, however, went on changing his principles while working in this movement. In 1919 he was a liberal socialist, in 1920 he became anarchist, in 1921 for some time he opposed the socialists and democrats and then co-operated with them for a while and ultimately seceded from them and chalked out a new policy of his own. This capriciousness, this indifference to principles, this opportunism is not something particular with Mussolini, it is a natural concomitant of nationalism. What a selfish man does in individual life is done by a nationalist in national life. It is impossible for him to give permanent faith to a principle or ideology.

But a more direct conflict between nationalism and the *shariats* of God occurs in yet another way. It is obvious that whatever messenger is sent by God, he must take birth in same nation and in same country. Again, the Book of Laws which would be given must necessarily be in the language of the country to which he has been deputed. Moreover the sacred and holy places associated with the mission of that Rasool must be situated mostly in that particular country. But in spite of these limitations that truth and that divine teaching which a Rasool brings from God, is not confined to one nation or country, it is intended for humanity at large. The entire human race is called upon to believe in that Rasool and his teachings, and whether that Rasool has a limited mission, as Noah and Moses and many other Rasools had, or a universal mission, as Abraham and Muhammad had, in either case all mankind are ordered to respect and believe in every Rasool and when the mission of a Rasool is universal it is natural that the Book of Laws given to him by God must acquire an international status; the culrural influence of the language he speaks must be

international; the sacred places associated with his mission, in spite of their being situated in one country must become centres of international importance. And not only that Rasool but also his companions and the prominent persons taking part in his movement at its inception, in spite of their being connected with one nation, would become the heroes of all nations. All this falls contrary to the taste, temperament, sentiments and thoughts of a nationalist. The national self-conciousness of a nationalist can never brook it that he should take as his hero persons who do not belong to his nationality; accept the central importance and sanctity of such places as are not situated within his country; admit the cultural influence of a language which may not be his own; secure inspiration from traditions which may have been imported from outside. He would regard all these things not only as foreign but would look upon them with that displeasure and hatred with which everything of foreign invaders is received, and would endeavour his best to eliminate and cast out all these external influences from the life of his nation. It is the natural demand of his nationalistic sentiment that he should associate his sentiments of sacredness and sanctity with his own home-land, that he should sing hymns to rivers and mountains of his own dountry, that he should revive his ancient national historical traditions (traditions which this foreign religion describe as the relics of the age of ignorance) and pride in them, that he should relate his present with his own past and link his national culture with that of his own ancestors in a chronicle sequence, that he should take as his heroes, historical or legendary persons from his own nation and take inspiration only from their deeds, imaginary or real. In short, it is in the nature and constitution of nationalism that it should condemn everything that comes from outside and praise all those

things which are the products of its own home. The ultimate goal to which this path leads is that even the religion which has been imported must be completely abandoned and those religious traditions which may have come down to a nationalist from the "age of ignorance" of his own national history be praised and glorified. Many nationalists might not have reached this ultimate goal and might be lingering somewhere midway, but the path they are traversing only leads to this goal.

What is happening to-day in Germany is the best interpretation and explanation of this natural property of nationalism. One section of the Nazis is openly disclaiming Jesus, because he was of the Jewish race, and to be Jew is enough argument that an Aryan racialist should reject altogether all his cultural, moral and spiritual values. Thus these people unscrupulously declare that Jesus was a proletarian Jew, a forerunner of Marx; that is why he said "the weak shall inherit earth." As against this, those Nazis who still pose some faith in Jesus say that he was of Nordic race. That is, a German nationalist would either discredit Jesus because he was a Jew, or if he believes he would believe not in the Jesus of Israel but in the Jesus of the Nordic race! At any rate his religion is circumscribe by his nationalism. A German nationalist would never be prepared to accept a non-Aryan as the leader of a moral and spiritual culture.[1] The limit is reached when we learn that to German nationalists even that God is unacceptable whose conception is imported from outside. In some Nazi circles attempts are being made to dig up those gods which were worshipped by the Teutonic tribes of old. Thus by a minute and careful research of ancient history a complete pantheon has been reconstructed, and Wotan, who was in

[1] Exactly the same position was taken by the Jews of Arabia who refused to believe in the mission of Muhammad because he was not risen from Israel.

the "age of ignorance" called by the Teutons as the "god of tempest" appointed as the Chief Deity. This religious movement is of recent origin. But even the creed which is being officially administered to the Nazi youths does not present God as the Lord and Sovereign of all creation but as the Lord and Sovereign of the German people only. The words of this creed are, "We believe in God as the eternal manifestation of force and life, on the earth and in the universe... the idea of God is natural for the Germanic man. Our concept of God and Eternity has nothing in common with the tenets of any confession or any religious philosophy. We believe in the eternity of this German nation and eternal Germany because we believe in the eternity of force and life. We believe in the correctness of the national-socialist concept of life. We believe in the righteousness of our goals. We believe in Adolf Hitler, our great leader.

That is, God is the name of that force and life which has incarnated itself into the German nation, and the German nation is the earthly manifestation of this God. Hitler is his Prophet and "national goals" are the religion brought by that Prophet. The conception of religion which may accord nearest to the mentality of a nationalist cannot be else this.

THE AIM OF WESTERN NATIONALISM

When nationalism would progress on European lines it must ultimately reach this climax. Those who are still plodding through the interlying stages and have not reached this climax, have lagged behind only because their nationalistic sentiments have not been so brutally hurt as those of the Germans after the Great War of 1914-18. But take it for certain that when they have begun their march on the path of nationalism their ultimate goal is necessarily the

same perfect kind of ignorant prejudice which is not content without having nationalized even God and religion. This is the natural outcome of nationalism. Having adopted nationalism as one's creed how can one escape its natural consequences? First see, what is it that, as soon as an Egyptian adopts the nationalistic way of thinking, it diverts his attention at once to the days of the ancient Pharaohs, that makes an Iranian devoutly passionate for the legendary personalities of the *Shah-Nama*, that sends an Indian back to Vedic times and makes him chant hymns to the Ganges and the Jumna, that compels a Turk to extricate Arabic influence from his language, his literature, from every department of his cultural life and in every matter consult the traditions of the age of ignorance of Turkish history? What other psychological explanation can you give of it except that when nationalism captures the heart and mind of a person all his interest are constrained within the circle of his nationality. Outside this circle he turns his face from everything.

There is now lying before me, an article, entitled *The Turkish Women in History* by the Director General of Publicity, Ankara. The introductory sentences of the thesis read: "Before we begin to study the high and honourable place our young republic has chosen to give to Turkish womanhood it will be necessary to review the consecutive periods of the Turkish woman's life in history. This little study will show that the equality of rights which Turkish men and women enjoy today is not unusual an event in our national history. We shall also see that so long as the Turkish family and Turkish social organizations were free from foreign influences the Turkish women was always an active participant in every social movement. The subject was well studied by our famous socialist Ziya Gok Alp and his investigations produced many proofs of the rights

which women enjoyed in the old Turkish civilization. Some of these proofs will help to elucidate the matter and to show an intimate connection between the early Turkish woman and modern woman of today with her social and political emancipation.

Consider these sentences. How the nationalist Turk dissociates himself from that period of his history in which his nation had come under "foreign influence", and how for his present he takes as standard that past when his nation was free of this foreign influence. Thus it is that nationalism which turns the mind of man from Islam to ignorance. Ziya Gok Alp who, from the social and cultural point of view, is, in fact the founder of modern Turkey, and on whose programme the Turkish nation is working today, in the words of Halide Edib Hanem:

'Wanted to build a new Turkey which would remove the gulf between the Ottoman Turks and their Turanian ancestors... He wanted to lay down a new cultural foundation with the material he had collected about cultural and political institutions from the pre-Islamic period of Turkish History. He believed that the Islam which was established by the Arabs would not suit our purpose. If we wish not to return to our age of ignorance we at present need a religious reform which may conform with our temperaments'.

These are not the words of some European propagandist who might have aimed at discrediting Turkey; they are the words of a nationalist Turkish woman herself. These words clearly speak how when nationalism enters the heart and mind of a Muslim from one direction Islam leaves them from another direction. And this is not something particular with the poor Turks. Any Muslim who has pledged himself to the evil of nationalism has been divorced by the angels of Islam. Only recently a "Muslim"

poet of India wrote a national anthem in which addressing "Mother India" he says:

Thou art that treasure-house whose water is the water of life;

Thou art that barn whose grains are electrons;

Thou art that mine whose pebbles are jewels;

Thou art that garden which makes this world a paradise;

Thou art the home of gods and goddesses, we will convert thee into a Kaaba with our prostrations.

The last two lines leave no ambiguity as to the fact that Islam and nationalism are conneted with two entirely and totally antagonistic mentalities and they can never meet. Nationalism is, indeed, a religion which stands as a rival, an adversary against the *shariats* of God.[1] It opposes the shariats of God not only in the intellectual plane but also in practical working, aims to establish its sovereignty on all those departments of human life which the *shariats* of God propose to bring under their own control. Now a reasonable person has no other alternative except to select one of these two claimants of heart and mind, and body and soul, and surrender himself to it and when he has entered the folds of one should not even so much as mention the name of the other.

[1] "Nationalism has usurped the place of both religion and personal conscience... and today one who refuses to fall down and worship the God-state the keeper of his conscience may be deprived of personal liberty or shut out from the privileges of citizenship."

Social Philosophies In conflict p.450.

WHY IS THE WORLD FALLEN UNDER THE CURSE OF NATIONALISM

It is indisputably true that in present times the nations of the world are acquainted with only one tried method of achieving freedom and progress and prestige and honour, and that is the method of nationalism. Consequently every nation which wants to rise falls to this method. Before running towards it, because others are doing so, we ought to consider why it is that the world is so disposed. The world is so disposed only because it does not possess a national moral teaching which may regulate individual and social wants, keep within legal limits desires and ambitions, give right direction to the powers of action and motivity. It is this thing which has misled the nations. It is this shortcoming which has driven the nations towards ignorance, tyranny and barbarism. Even in our own country Hindus, Sikhs and Parsis are adopting the nationalistic ideas of the West only because they have not got that guidance and teaching. If there is any cure of this calamity, and remedy of this ill, it is only in the *shariats* of God, and it is only Muslims in the world who can represent His Shariats. Thus it was the duty of the Muslim that he should have come out and struck at the very root of that ignorant prejudice which is twinning itself round the world like the parasitic lianas. He should have told the nations of the earth that for them not only the path of freedom, progress, honour and prestige but also that of safety, peace and real happiness is that defined and demarcated by the Rasools of God and not that which is shown to them by those leaders of evil and mischief who hold commission from the devil. But it is the greatest and most grievous tragedy of modern times that the only party, of Muslims, which has been appointed by God to establish and spread the mission of Rasools on this earth, has declined its fundamental responsibility, and instead of guiding the misguided world

with the torch of truth, is itself eager to follow those going into wilderness.

NATIONALISM IN INDIA

In the foregoing pages we have established fundamentally that in sociology the nationalistic view-point stands in total contradiction to the Islamic view-point. Therefore, if Muslim is one who upholds the Islamic ideology in every concern of life, and if the word "Muslim" does not mean anything else, it follows automatically that a Muslim, wherever and in whaterver condition he happens to be, must fight against nationalism. This principle having been accepted, it becomes futile to think what part should Muslims play in the nationalistic movement of this or that country. But when we are told that nationalism should be encouraged in India and that the salvation of India lies in the progress of this thing, we feel ourselves obliged to consider the special condition prevailing in India and examine as to what is or what would be, the ultimate end of the progress of nationalism in this land, and determine whether the salvation of India really lies in this procedure.

THE ESSENTIALS OF NATIONALISM

Nationalism can take birth in a country only if there exists a nationality already, or if it does not exist already, it should come into being now, because the conception of nationalism without the presence of a nationality is devoid of any sense. Nationalism is, indeed, another name for nationality inflamed. Where there is no fire there can be no flame.

Now it is to be ascertained what kind of nationality is required to enkindle the flame of nationalism.

One kind of nationality is the "political nationality" that is, people who are governed by one political system, are in virtue of this political unity looked upon as one nation. For this type of nationality it is not necessary that

there should be a homogeneity in the sentiments and susceptibilities, thoughts and opinions, moral dispositions, traditions, language, literature, and mode of living of those who participate in it. They may differ from one another, entirely in all these respects, yet may form one political nationality and this unity would remain intact so long as they may be associated with one political system. If the various sections of people not only differ from but also oppose one another, that is, if their national aim and aspirations mutually conflict and they indulge in actual struggles against one another, even then their political nationality would remain one. The word "nationality" is, indeed, applied to this kind of unity, but it is obvious, this is not that nationality which gives birth to nationalism.

The second type of nationality is that which is known as the "cultural nationality". This nationality is found among those people who are of one religion; who are identical in their thoughts and ideas and sentiments and feelings; who display the same kind of moral characteristics; who hold common view-point in relation to all the important problems of life – a viewpoint which may have effected a uniformity even in the cultural and social manifestations of their life; who take common standards of likes and dislikes, lawfulness and unlawfulness, sacredness and profaneness; who mutually understand their susceptibilities; who are familiar with the habits, temperaments and leanings of one another; who are bound together by these ties of blood and affection because of inter-marriages and social relations; who are liable to be motivated by the same kind of historical traditions – in short it is found only among those who mentally, spiritually, morally, culturally and socially have become one people, an organic whole. If nationalism can sprout, it can do so only in the soil of such nationality. Only those people, who manifest this nationality, can develop a common national type and evolve a common national idea.

It is from the attachment to this national type and the perfection of this national idea that nationalism takes its origin. The same thing later on develops into that "national-self" into which an individual prefers to lose his own "self". After this when some actual or imaginary thing happens to hamper the growth of the national-self then to remove it, is enkindled that passion which is called nationalism.

ARE THE FACTORS OF NATIONALISM OBTAINABLE IN INDIA?

Keep the above analysis in view and take a stock of the Indian situation. Do you really find in this land the foundation of nationalism? Political nationality is, indeed, found here, because the inhabitants of this country are bound under one political system, governed by one and the same kind of social and economic laws; one steel-frame holds them all in its grip. But, as pointed out above, mere political nationality is not sufficient to originate the sentiment of nationalism. This kind of nationality existed in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in Britain and Ireland, in Czarist Russia, in the Ottoman Empire, in Czechoslovakia, in Yugoslavia and in many other countries, but it could breed nationalism nowhere. Even common desires for freedom and common hardships and dangers are not adequate to give birth to nationalism. Nationalism can take birth only from cultural nationality; and everyone who has eyes can see that the people of India do not constitute a cultural nationality.

If the fact is this, why does one speak here of nationalism at all? Can the talk of a child, where there is no trace of a mother, mean anything other than stupidity? Those who plead that nationalism should be encouraged in this country, should learn that this child can come out of the womb of cultural nationality alone, and before the child is born, the birth of the mother is essential. When they have learned this truth thoroughly they will have to modify their

claim. Before they think of encouraging nationalism in India, they will have to say that they want to build a cultural nationality which may subsequently hatch in nationalism.

HOW CAN INDIAN NATIONALISM TAKE BIRTH?

First consider the question: How can a cultural nationality spring up here and what would be its possible consequences?

In a country which abounds in cultural nationalities a new nationality can form only in either of the two ways:–

1. The culture of one nation may conquer and absorb the cultures of other nations.
2. A common culture may evolve by mutual interaction and interfusion of all the cultures.

The first possibility is here out of question, because the advocates of Indian nationalism cannot make it their cherished goal. It can become the goal of only those who plead for "Hindu Nationalism" or "Muslim Nationalism".[1]

---

[1] Apparently this combination of the words "Muslim" and "Nationalism" sounds very strange. But in this world of wonders such wonderful things do happen. Among the Indian Muslim today we find two kinds of nationalists: the "Nationalist Muslims", namely, those who in spite of their being Muslims believe in "Indian Nationalism" and worship it; and the "Muslim Nationalists", namely those people who are little concerned with Islam and its principles and aims, but are concerned with the individuality and the political and economic interests of the nation wich has come to exist by the name of "Muslim", and they are so concerned only because of their accidence of birth in that nation. From the Islamic view-point both these types of nationalists are equally misled, for Islam enjoins faith in truth only; it does not permit any kind of nation-worshipping at all. But unfortunately both these types of nationalists are ignorant of their un-Islamic position. Particularly the second type of people are today vaunting loudly that they are the champions of Islam in India, although their position is hardly different from that of the Hindu nationalists. A Hindu nationalist, because he is born in the Hindu nation, endeavours to enhance the cause of those who are Hindus; and those Muslim, nationalists, because they are born in a nation which is called "Muslim", want to exalt those who are connected

As for the Indian Nationalists; they can unite only on the basis of the second proposition. And, indeed, they often discuss in their own circles as to how a composite nationality can be evolved by compounding together the different nationalities in this country. But in this connection they talk so childishly that, it appears, they neither understand the nature of cultural nationality, nor are they informed – by what process and under what laws the interfusion does take place of such nationalities, nor again, they have considered it, for once, as to what is the type of the nationality which results from such interfusion. They regard it as a child's play and also want to play it like children.

Cultural nationality is, in fact, the name of mental temperament and moral constitution of a nation. This thing is not achieved in a day or two by artificial means, rather it evolves through centuries in a natural order. For hundreds of years, from generation to generation, a people live together, subscribing to the same creed, customs and traditions, it is then that a common spirit manifests itself in them, common moral characteristics stabilise, a special mental temperament develops, the traditions take root which govern their emotions and sentiments, the literature comes into being which reflects their mind and heart, and the intellectual and moral harmony arises which prepares them for mutual intelligibility and affection. Moreover, when under these deep and powerful influences a group is transformed into a permanent nationality, or, in other words, when its moral and mental temperament stabilises,

---

with this nation. Neither of the two comes forward with a moral end or with a creed that is supported by universal principles. As the Hindu would be satisfied in his own case, so these people would be fully satisfied if Muslims were to rule supreme – they would little mind if they had established their government on un-Islamic foundations, and if their behaviour and procedure did not differ, in the least, from those of non-Muslims.

it becomes impossible for it to intermingle with some other group and convert itself into some other nationality. Oftentimes such groups live together as neighbours for hundreds of years under the same climate and in the same soil but no kind interfusion takes place at all. In Europe the Germans, the Magyars, the Poles, the Czechs, the Jews, the Slavs and many other similar nationalities have been living in the same environment for ages together but up to this day no interfusion has occurred among them. The English and the Irish lived together for centuries but could not be blended into one. Sometimes these groups share a common language but a unity of tongue does not effect a unity of heart and mind. Words may be common but they arouse different sensations and thoughts in the minds of different people.

No, doubt, in some cases different cultural groups, having lived together over a wide stretch of time, can mould into a perfect and correct type of composite nationality. But it happens only when their moral system and mental temperaments do not differ from one another significantly and violently, but rather resemble one another closely. (This condition is essential if cultural results of a high order are to be produced). In this case their distinct moral characteristics and their separate national individualities are obliterated and superseded by a unified system of morals. But even this process is not so easy as said. Action and reaction, integration and disintegration continue for ages and harmonise into one organic whole. In England, the Britons, the Saxons and the Normans took centuries to consolidate into one nation. In France, this process has continued for the last one thousand years but up to now has not been able to build the right kind of nationality. In Italy, up to this day no common national spirit has appeared, although all the different elements,

which have gone to compose the Italian nationality, do not bear any appreciable antagonism to one another, from the moral point of view. In the United States of America, only those elements have interfaced to make a nationality which possessed almost the same moral characteristics, and who were compelled by common interests to lay aside, at once, their rival difference and incongruities and become one body, one soul. But even this process has taken about three hundred years to complete.

Nations which possess similar moral characteristics can interfuse to form a good and perfect type of nationality, because in experiencing this interfusion they are not called upon to divorce their creeds and conceptions and their moral standards and wipe out summarily their high moral attributes. These things already happen to be common amongst them. Their new nationality is built by a mere amendment of traditions and a re-adjustment of emotions, sentiments, aims and aspirations. On the othr hand when nations possessing different moral characteristics are interfused by some artificial pressure, by some counterfeit effort, by some very low motives, the result is that a nationality of a very inferior type comes into being, because in this circumstance the foundations of their creeds are rocked, their high moral traits (which had been their distinguishing features and in the presence of which no interfusion could be possible) are destroyed, their national sentiments (which formed the basis of their nationality), are benumbed. Every one of these nations is obliged to change its standards of goodness and virtue, and the new nationality which they combine to make becomes a hotchpotch of their worst morals. This kind of interfusion shatters the moral system of nations, and a new moral system takes a long time to build. From their past traditions the nations are severed, and new traditions remain long in

the making before they are confirmed. They exterminate their national types with their own hands, and a new type forms but through long waiting. Those who are involved in this precarious condition are unable to show any strength and integrity in their character. They must be mean, shallow, base-hearted, ungenerous, capricious and unprincipled. They are very like that leaf which has fallen from its tree and is wafted from place to place by the vagaries of the weird, finding no repose anywhere. Observers who have seen intermingling and interfusion of people with different moral characteristics in Brazil, declare that this pestilence has equally undermined the noble traits of all those nations which have come under its influence. On account of this unnatural fusion, the race that is springing up in that country is presenting the worst specimen of humanity in every respect – mental, moral and physical.

Now any one who possesses the least insight into sociology, and who, remaining free from the influence of his political leanings, gives his opinions only on the basis of truth realised from facts, cannot assert that the cultural nationalities found today in India display similar moral characteristics. The difference between these nations (Hindu, Muslim, etc.) are more deep-rooted than those found between the different cultural nationalities in Europe. Here one creed differs from another as much as the east from the west. The principles of one culture are entirely different from those of another. There are wide gulfs between the sources of tradition. Emotions and sentiments are mutually repulsive and antagonistic. The national type of one bears hardly anything common to that of another in general appearances. To try to build a composite and interfused nationality by destroying these various nationalities, only for political ends, would

necessarily produce the same results to which I have referred above. Almost two centuries of British rule has already thrown these nations into the moral degeneration, continued bondage has already consumed their spirit of nobleness; their characters are vitiated; their faiths are shaken; they are almost disconnected with their standards of morals have gone down; their moral characteristics have lost stability. Hideous consequences of this degradation and generation can be noticed widely in the new generations. Under these conditions if the business of forging a new nationality is resorted to and for this purpose, the cultural foundations (which are already bettered) of these nations are his hard, believe it, the entire moral structure of the country would fall to the ground, and its consequences would be most horrible.

CAN ANY WELL-WISHER OF INDIA THINK OF THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF NATIONALISM HERE?

It is mere puerile thinking which leads our political leaders to decide unhesitatingly that to get rid of the foreign yoke it is necessary to promote nationalism in this country, and in order to promote nationalism it is essential to build a nationality, that is, all the existing nationalities be decomposed and reshuffled into a new nationality. If these men were possessed with true insight and would be able to free themselves from the mental slavery of the West, they would think for themselves and be convinced that this way had not the salvation of India but its ruin.

First, to achieve freedom by this means would be a long and tiresome business. The destruction of cultural nationalities whose foundations are rooted in traditions of hundreds and thousands of years; the coming into existence

of a new nationality in their place; and then the consolidation of this nationality and its getting enkindled into a nationalism – all this is not an easy affair, it would in any case must involve a long expanse of time, and if the attainment of political liberty is dependent on this thing India will have to wait for several generations yet.

Secondly, even if freedom is achieved by this method, it would, as we have examined above, ultimately hurl down the whole country into the inferno of moral degeneration.

Thirdly, all those nations, which have the least consciousness of their individualities, would certainly resist this nation-making most stubbornly, and in this connection no opportunity would arise of launching a united struggle for the freedom of the country. Thus for getting deliverance from the foreign yoke it would not be even a distant approach, what to speak of its being a short cut. If the adoption of this method is insisted upon as unreasonably as today, it would not be much to say that the dream of political independence may never be realised.

For these reasons in my opinion it is very foolish on their part who, aping the Western nations, have arrived at the conclusion that nationalism is the only successful means with which the country can be freed. I have said it frequently in the past and am repeating once again that for the liberty and political and economic progress of India a national unity and nationalism are in the least essential. In a country where different cultural nationalities exist, to try to mould them into one would not only be unnecessary, and wrong in principle, but considering the consequences, it would be harmful instead of being of any use. In such circumstances not unitary principles but only federal principles can work. The permanent status and individuality of every nation should be recognised; every one of them should be allowed autonomous and sovereign

control over its national "subjects", and the different nations should agree upon a joint action only in so far as the common interests of the country were concerned. Therefore, this is the only way which can guarantee safety and preservation to the individuality of all the parties in the country; and this is the only thing which can bring on to one front all the forces in the contry which are struggling for political supremacy.

WESTERN DRESS

About nationalism and about its adoption enough has been said for the time being. The subject is really so vast that a detailed study of it is outside the scope of this essay. One aspect of the problem is, however, of great importance, therefore I would say a word or two about it before I conclude. At the beginning of our enquiry we had seen that a particular and well known section of Indian Muslims advocates with full gusto the encouragement of Western nationalism in this country. The self-same people make strong recommendation for the adoption of Western dress by Indian Muslims. They say it is the first step towards national salvation.

These Oriental nationalists are, indeed, a very strange creature. On the one hand they make intense and violent propaganda of their nationalism, and on the other hand they show least scrupulousness in appropriating the dress and culture of an alien people of an alien country. Nay, they do not stop here. They struggle so hard to popularise this dress and culture in their nation that it appears as if this too is an item of their national programme. They are so stubborn that wherever they happen to wield political power they do not hesitate I imposing it on to their people by force. This aggressive policy is being followed with equal vehemence in India, Iran, Egypt and Turkey, although the natural

demand of nationalism – if this word has anything to do with national self-respect – is that a person should persist in sticking to the dress and culture of his own nation, should regard it as a mark of prestige and honour and take pride in it. Where this element is altogether wanting from the very beginning, God knows how nationalism enters there. The absence of national self-respect and nationalism are clearly the opposite of each other, but our Oriental nationalists are adepts in patching together the opposites. The Truth is that in order to escape from a contradictory attitude in thought and action a person must possess a healthy brain and a keen observation, and if one possessed these virtues why should one deviate at all from the right path of nature and stray adrift in the way of nationalism?

Islam does not co-operate with the people even in this matter. In every department of life the most clear, straight, reasonable and natural path that can be had is Islam. And as Islam does not tolerate the exaggeration of nationality, that is, nationalism, so also it does not tolerate anything which aims at breaking the legitimate natural limitations of nationality, and destroying the individuality or distinguishing features of nations and subjecting them to moral debasement.

The Quran informs us that although all mankind is of one origin two kinds of distinctions exist in it: the distinction of man, woman and the distinction of descent, tribe and nationality.

"Ye mankind! We created you from a man and woman and divided you in nations and tribes so that you may know one from another". "And God created the two sexes of man and woman."

Both these distinctions are the basis of human culture and social life and it is the demand of creation that they should be preserved within their proper limits. The

distinction that exists between man and woman is to stimulate psychological attraction between them. Thus it became necessary that in cultural and social life the distinctive features of the two should be fully preserved. And the distinction between nations is so that, for cultural needs, mankind may be organised into such social orders as may cooperate with one another with ease and convenience. Thus it became necessary that each group or each cultural or social order should possess certain distinguishing traits by means of which the members of one group or order may mutually recognise one another, may understand one another, and may be identified from members of other orders. These distinguishing features are, obviously, reflected in language, dress, mode of living, and mark of culture. So it is the will and purpose of Nature that they should be preserved.

On this very account Islam forbids the practice of imitating. In the authentic sayings of Muhammad (S.A.W.) it is reported that he condemns such woman as attires herself in the manner of man, and such man as attires himself in the manner of woman. Another report says that he condemns all such men as try to copy the likeness of woman, and all such women as try to copy the likeness of man. It is because the natural psychological attraction which God has provided between man and woman is coerced and diminished by such mimetics, and Islam wants to preserve and maintain it. Similarly to endeavour to destroy the dress, culture, and habits of nation and mix them together indiscreetly is to fight against social good and social interest. Therefore, Islam is opposed to this also. When the national distinction is extended beyond its natural frontiers and raised to nationalism, Islam will war against it, because this germ gives birth to aggressive prejudice and imperialism. But Islam is inimical to

nationalism rather than to nationality. While it is antagonistic to nationalism it wants to preserve nationality; and it is as much against exterminating it as against encouraging it beyond proper limits. So the moderate and balanced view that Islam takes in this matter you may realise from the following notices:

1. A companion of Muhammad (S.A.W.) asked him as to what is meant by prejudice, and whether the act of loving one's nation is prejudice? He replied, "No; when one goes with one's nation even when it is wrong, it is prejudice". *(Ibn-i-Majah)*
2. The Rasool said, "He who apes a people will be counted with it." *(Abu-Daud)*
3. Umar, the second Khalifa, wrote to Utba-bin-Farqad, the governor at Azerbaijan, "Take care, do not adopt the dress of the unbelievers."

   (Mulsim: Book of Dress and Fashion)
4. Umar had given universal orders to his governors to prevent their non-Muslim subjects from adopting the dress and appearances of Arabs. This practice was so strictly observed that on many occasions when treaties were concluded with other people it was definitely laid down as one of terms of the agreement that they would not clothe themselves like the Muslims.

   ("Book of Revenue"; Imam Abu Yusuf)

Those Arabs who were stationed in Iraq, Iran and other countries on military and administrative duties were continually exhorted by Umar and Ali to preserve their language and accent and not try to lisp in foreign tongues.

(Baihaqi)

These traditions clearly point out that the internationalism which Islam advocates never aims at wiping out the distinguishing marks of nations and confuse

them together. On the contrary, it wants to preserve the nationality and national characteristic of nations and create amongst them such a concord of cultures and morals and creeds and ideas that it may cut at the root of international misunderstandings, obstructions, tyranny and prejudice, and inspire them with the spirit of co-operation and brotherhood.

Imitation has another evil aspect on account of which Islam condemns it. This other aspect is that members of a nation abandon their national characteristics only when they are fallen a prey to some psychological weakness and some moral laxity. He who gives up his own colour and character and admits the influence of others and styles himself in their fashions, must necessarily be a victim of fickleness, shallowness and volatility. If preventive measures were not taken this disease whould spread on. And if it becomes an epidemic it would subject the entire nation to psychological enfeeblement. There will not remain any integrity in its morals. Its mental background would become so unstable that it would not be able to support the firm foundation of morals and habits at all. Therefore, Islam is at no cost prepared to allow a nation to nourish in its own body this psychological disease. It is not only Muslims but also non-Muslims whom Islam wants to protect from this disease, for it does not want to see any human being suffering moral weakness.

This disease finds a congenial home in the land of conquered and vanquished peoples. They do not suffer simply from moral weakness; in fact, they stand disgraceful in their own eyes; they look down upon themselves and exult and pride in aping their rulers, because the ideal of honour, nobility, greatness, culture, elegance, decency, or what other virtues they can conceive of, they find illustrated only in their masters. Slavery eats into their

essence of humanity so deep that they are induced to become bodily the advertisement of being ashamed.[1] Islam which has come to raise mankind from depths to heights, cannot brook it for a moment that any human group should fall into the abysmal hell of self-abasement lower than which there is nothing. This is why in the regime of Umar, non-Arab nations came under the Islamic rule, he prevented them strictly from imitating the Arabs. The very aim of Islamic Jehad (struggle) would have been defeated if these nations had been allowed to develop a slavish mentality. That Rasool of God (Muhammad) did not give standard of Islam to the Arabs in order that with its help they should become the masters of nations. And nations should develop slavish habits under their supervision. On these grounds Islam forbids a nation to try to reflect the exact features of another nations and imitate its dress and mode of living. Now as far as the cultural and civilizational reciprocation which naturally takes place among friendly nations, Islam not only regards it as legitimate but also encourages it. It does not thrust such impenetrable barriers of prejudices between nations that any chance of cultural exchange between them may altogether be precluded. The Rasool of God, Muhammad (S.A.W.) sometimes wore the Syrain gown which was a complement of Jewish dress. He also sometimes put on the Roman gown with close fitting sleeves, which was used by Roman Catholic Christians. He

[1] Anyone doubts the truth of this assertion may see in India itself the difference between the Indians and the English. A handful of Englishmen, scattered and separated from the one another, have been living in India for about two and a half centuries, but you might have never seen even one of them adopting Indian dress. As against this now it is rather impossible to count those Indian who stride amongst us with English externals from head to foot. It is not only in matters of dress but also in their speech, and accent, in their ways and manners, in their movements and gestures, in everything they try to produce a photographic copy of the English. After, all, what explanation can be given for it?

even graced the Iranian "qaba" (mantle) garment of Nausherwan's age. Umar used the "Brunus", which was a kind of high vaulted cap, and which formed a part of the dress of Christian friars. This 'retail' use of miscellaneous things is quite different from imitation. Imitation means that the entire appearance and bearing of a person should assume the likeness of the members of another nations, and it would become impossible for one to identify him as to which nation he really belongs. Against this what we are denoting with the word "exchange" is that a nation may borrow a good or suitable thing from another nation and make it a constituent of its own dress, and in spite of this its national bearing, as a whole, may remain undisturbed.